

## **COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, ENROLLMENT & REVENUE ADMINISTRATION**

**October 9, 2001**

**7:00 PM**

Chairman Hirschmann called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Hirschmann, Levasseur, Pinard, Thibault, Lopez

Messrs: S. Wickens, J. Shaffer, K. Buckley, R. Sherman

Chairman Hirschmann addressed item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Guy Beloin, Financial Analyst II, submitting monthly financial statements for the three months ended September 30, 2001.

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to accept the reports.

Chairman Hirschmann addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Sharon Wickens, Financial Analyst II, submitting reports as follows:

- a) department legend;
- b) open invoice report over 90 days by fund;
- c) open invoice report (all invoices for interdepartmental billings only);
- d) open invoice report (all invoices due from the School District only); and
- e) customer comments report - customers meeting over 90 day criteria

Alderman Lopez moved to accept the report. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez stated in looking at Page 1 where it shows 1998 over 30 days, isn't there a three year statutory rule where you release those.

Ms. Wickens replied yes and some of them are in the hands of the Solicitor.

Alderman Lopez asked some of these that are listed.

Ms. Wickens answered some of them but not all of them. Like Mark Paris I know I recently sent something on that. He was in an accident and he caused some damage and that is the piece of the administrative fees that they are trying to collect. I would have to look on each one of them but I can check on that.

Alderman Lopez stated well in the future those things that are over three years of age, if you are still working on them and still collecting money I can understand that but if we keep putting them here, maybe a little more information like they are paying \$1 a week or something.

Ms. Wickens replied I will check on them. I know that some of them are in the hands of the Solicitor and some of them probably could be put on the write-off list because I think they have gone to collection.

Chairman Hirschmann called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Hirschmann addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from Sharon Wickens, Financial Analyst II, submitting the first quarter fiscal year 2002 write off list for Accounts Receivable.

Alderman Thibault moved to approve the write-offs. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Thibault asked do we keep tabs on these people who have, in fact, left the City hanging for some of these balances. In other words, do we keep any kind of a record so that if these people ever apply for something again we shouldn't let them have anything until they pay that balance.

Ms. Wickens answered there is a comment in the HTE system that says that there has been X amount of dollars that has been written off for this customer and when people are doing business they should be checking to make sure that this person isn't set-up and if they are set-up, are there any outstanding comments in there. Every one of these has a comment that they have been submitted for write-off.

Alderman Thibault asked so in other words if they come back and try to reapply for something, this is going to come up.

Ms. Wickens answered right as long as the person they are doing business with, whether it be Tax Collector, City Clerk or whoever, looks it up in the system. It is on the system.

Alderman Thibault asked is this...even after we take them off the list as we will right now, do you still keep track of that.

Ms. Wickens answered yes.

Alderman Lopez stated maybe just to make sure I don't think you do a check-up but maybe the auditor could take some of this list and see if the policy is as Alderman Thibault said. Maybe the auditor could go down to like the Tax Office and check on Michael Trisciani and see if his name is flagged there because if he tries to register his car and he owes us money he should be flagged. That is what you are saying, correct?

Ms. Wickens replied right. If someone went into the HTE system they are flagged but they have to use that system.

Alderman Lopez asked how do we check that to make sure.

Ms. Wickens asked how do I check to see if someone is actually using the system when the people come through the door. I don't know what each department...

Alderman Lopez interjected my question is you say it is in the HTE system but how do we insure that the people who want the service...let's say for example the Tax Collector. How do we insure that that information is there? Is it something you would check on?

Ms. Wickens replied I don't know if when they audit accounts receivable if that would be something that they would look to make sure that we have comments on all of our write-offs. That is definitely something that probably should be done.

Alderman Lopez stated if we have this on the HTE system and I understand that auto registration is separate but in doing business throughout the City how do we insure who checks to make sure that department heads...

Mr. Buckley replied what I could do is add that as an audit step for any audit that I do that while I am in the agency and I pull an expenditure sample that is one of the things that I will check on or pull a revenue sample if someone buys a license I

can check on it. Part of what I have been doing is standardizing audit programs so things like that will be in every single program and I check on it automatically.

Alderman Lopez responded that is super.

Chairman Hirschmann stated I have a question in regards to this list. There is one group name that keeps coming up and he is under different corporations, Cadillac Motel/Robert Jodoin, JARB Realty Trust/Robert Jodoin, and PJB Realty/Robert Jodoin. This guy Robert Jodoin has a history of not paying bills all over the City for the amounts of \$1,010, \$100, \$1,050, etc. I would like to ask the Solicitor...

Deputy Solicitor Arnold interjected which list are you looking at.

Chairman Hirschmann stated I am on Item 5 and this was referred to the Solicitor's Office I believe. It says the statute of limitations has expired but the problem is that I have been on this Committee for four years. We have been chasing this guy around for the past four years. Why aren't we doing our job? Where is the failure in not collecting this money? He is not going to pay his bill this year, he is not going to be pay his bill next year or in the year 2004 until somebody figures out how to squeeze the guy.

Alderman Thibault replied this is what I was trying to say before. There should be some method of tracking that and if they ever apply for a Board of Health permit or any other kind of permit, zip that comes up and it says they owe money and they get nothing until they pay.

Alderman Levasseur stated we have been discussing this at nausea now for almost 18 months. We have dealt with this at probably every two meetings that we have had. We talked to the City Solicitor about this. The City Solicitor on many occasions has told us that the only way we can do anything else is to go after them statutorily and say if you don't pay a fireman's bill then you won't be able to get your car registration. We haven't had any kind of suggestions to this Board on what to do. It just seems like we keep bashing ourselves over the head on this issue. I understand that Mr. Jodoin is making a ton of money. That building is completely filled up. The parking lot is full every day. We know that there is no place for anybody to live so he is filled up right now. I find it to be abhorrent that the City Solicitor hasn't given us some suggestion in order to go after these people and I think that time is winding down for this Committee in the next couple of months and I don't know if Tom has any suggestions. Something has to be done and you are not getting it done and I think you have to do something soon.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated if they are called to my attention...the past policy as you know...

Alderman Levasseur interjected we brought this name to your attention I think the second month that I came into office. This was the first one that Alderman Hirschmann was screaming about in February of 2000.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated the present policy is to call them to my attention if they are over \$1,000. I think that some of these may have escaped because I see that a number of them are under \$1,000 and for some the statute of limitations expired on. If it is called to my attention before the statute expires, I can certainly go after this guy and will especially with a history like this. It may be a name to keep an eye on to make sure that given his past history he doesn't slip under the radar so to speak with under \$1,000 bills. I will do my best to keep my eye open for that.

Chairman Hirschmann stated, Sharon, this is a list of write-offs that have expired and that you want us to write-off. This individual under any corporate name does he have other balances due?

Ms. Wickens replied not that I am aware of and the invoice dates that you have out there, even though it says 6/30/97 they are probably prior to that. These are at least four or five years old and he has no new ones. I don't know of anything he has that is new so they are just really old and now that Tom has them, the statute of limitations has expired.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated you have to realize with the 6/30/97 date that that was the date of the conversion to HTE and consequently some of these balances are much older.

Alderman Thibault asked why isn't there a way that we could put this onto the auto registration or is there a way. I would think that everybody has a car that they have to register. 99% of the people have cars that they have to register. Why couldn't we put this on the auto registration just like we do for traffic violations?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered the reason we can't is in order to deny someone the ability to register a vehicle we need statutory authority for that. There is statutory authority for things like parking tickets. There is not statutory authority for what are general bills owed to the municipality on a number of different types of accounts. Basically the answer to that question is you can't do it unless there is a modification to the statute.

Alderman Thibault asked in other words something would need to be done in Concord.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered that is correct.

Alderman Thibault stated I cannot believe that there are any municipalities in this State that would not agree to do something like that. I think that this is something we should certainly look into. We have two Senators on this Board and I would think that they should be able to look into that and see if something could be done.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I would just note from the City Clerk's perspective that some of the things on here are related to business licensing. We don't check HTE...the Clerks out front couldn't possibly do that for all of the...first of all they don't have access but they couldn't do that for every item that they sell at the front counter. Certainly some of the stuff they sell they couldn't hold up anything on but we had seen the list in one of the communications to the Committee on Accounts and it was showing some things related to Parks & Recreation and I am using this as an example. Matt Normand does our business licensing and he spotted it and those were things that they were trying to collect for years and hadn't been able to and they were in for write-off. What he did was their business license was up for renewal and he told them that they had to pay that bill before they were going to get a business license and they did. They paid the bill off in cash. Ron Ludwig was obviously very happy with that because he had been trying to collect for some time. Certainly if somebody turns over a list to us we can give that to the person in charge of business licensing and they can at least do a cross-check and that gives us a chance to...because some of these definitely have businesses that are either looking for a Sunday license or something like that. We can refuse that and say you need to pay this other bill before we are going to give you a new license. That is something we have done. We have used that leverage in other cases. We also obviously have refused to give licenses to other people. I am not saying that it is going to be 100% successful in every instance because they can decide not to open on Sundays or do something else to get around it.

Alderman Thibault asked how do we get this going in the right direction.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered coordination at some point with the Finance Department.

Ms. Shaffer stated I was thinking and there are a lot of packages like that that are not actually on the HTE system, the receivable package itself so the individual that Carol is referring to would have to send a list to our department. For example, the Health Department issues food permits. We don't have a listing of those people who are delinquent.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied we don't have any delinquencies in our office. What I am saying is that somebody who has a delinquency if you gave us the list we could crosscheck. He could look down the list and know pretty much that yes this one or that one he could go after and try to do something.

Ms. Shaffer stated for those that aren't present on the system we could coordinate...

Deputy Clerk Johnson interjected whether it is present on the system or not, if we got a list. All we need is a list. He could go down it in five minutes and say yes these five we can do something for you one. Obviously if nobody asks us it is not going to get caught.

Chairman Hirschmann stated we are going to do is ask that a monthly list be provided to the Clerk's Office.

Ms. Shaffer stated the other thing is we don't charge any interest or penalties for delinquencies, which means that they feel they don't really have to pay up by a certain date because there is nothing hanging over their head whereas with the water and EPD bills they can shut off their service basically. We are not able to do anything like that within the policy that we have currently.

Chairman Hirschmann called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Hirschmann addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from Kevin Buckley, Internal Audit Manager, submitting the results of an audit conducted of the Highway Department's consumable inventory balance as of June 30, 2001.

Alderman Levasseur moved to accept the results. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez stated I think the auditor did an excellent job. What kind of a follow-up do we do when the recommendations come in and the department disputes some of the things or says they are going to do some of the things and don't? What kind of a follow-up would you do?

Mr. Buckley replied on this one this is the third year in a row that the internal auditor has audited this balance. It has been three different people who have audited it. Every year there has been a few observations and every year they have corrected the prior year's observations. I took the first two audits and whenever I do an audit if there is a prior audit report or comment from the independent auditor the first thing I do is look at the current status of any prior audit. That again is an audit step in all of my audits is to see if there are any prior audit comments to that agency and follow-up to see what they are doing. For audits that have many observations or serious observations, I would always try to schedule a follow-up audit in a year or two to make sure that the observations are taken care of.

Alderman Lopez stated I am looking on Page 7 of the auditor's response versus the recommendation. I am trying to figure out on Item 2 exactly what they are trying to say here. It is sort of like beating around the bush and I wondered if they don't accept your recommendation where do we go?

Mr. Buckley replied if someone doesn't accept my recommendation then I guess it would be up to the Committee to decide what they wanted to do about it. I tell them what I think is wrong and in a lot of instances there is a natural disagreement between the two sides and sometimes I will give an observation, particularly with internal control where I will say that the internal controls can be better but for practical purposes it will be too expensive or it will cause too much disruption to the agency. They may have a case for not wanting to do it that way and you may be able to live with them not doing it that way. At that point, I guess it is up to the Committee as to whether they want to instruct the department as to how they want them to handle it. In this case here, there was a slight disagreement but in general they were very receptive to everything I told them and we discussed everything and between us we pretty much came to a consensus of what they should be doing. I think next year when I go in again that all of these things will be cleared up.

Alderman Lopez stated I agree that there needs to be more organization on the site. I agree with you about something but what do I do about it?

Mr. Buckley replied I don't follow you.

Alderman Lopez stated well I am looking at the auditee's response and he agreed that there needs to be more organization on the site. What does that mean to me? It doesn't mean anything to me if he agrees to your recommendation.

Mr. Buckley replied right and we had talked after this whole thing about ways that he could organize. It is just going to take a lot of work to move things around and organize it. They have agreed to do that and they are going to be working on that. When I go out there the next time, I will look at how it is again.

Alderman Lopez stated maybe for standard policy as you go from year to year and people are not complying with some of the recommendations, you might asterisk that this has been a previous recommendation of yours that they have not complied with so that the Committee knows.

Mr. Buckley replied I think you will see that in a couple of the observations or maybe it is in the next report where I have mentioned a prior year observation and that it has been partially resolved or fully resolved. In the bigger ones I will actually put a chart in the back that shows prior year observations and the current status.

Chairman Hirschmann called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Hirschmann addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Report from the Committee on Administration regarding proposed fee increases relating to vending, entertainment and other activities impacted by the civic center.

Alderman Lopez moved to not refer this item to a public hearing. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Levasseur stated I think this may be the one instance...I actually think that anything that can go to public hearing should go to public hearing of course and I think that in this instance many of the people who would be impacted by these fees probably don't know that they are going to be impacted and some sort of public notice to this effect...myself being in the restaurant business and having a business downtown I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is actually one of those critical increases in fees that actually may get people motivated to come to a public meeting in the downtown. The Downtown Retail Association has gotten larger. Intown Manchester has become very well organized under Stephanie Lewry. The Hanover Street Committee is also well organized. There are also a lot of people who own properties down along the civic center who want to use the vending services outside. Again, you have the fee increase from \$10 to \$50 for people to put tables outside. I think that if there was a rallying support you might actually get a real good public hearing. I think it would be interesting and

something that would be informative for this Committee and probably for the Aldermen to see what downtown and this area is thinking about. I would actually like to see it go to a public hearing to get an idea of what is going on with the people downtown and make them feel like they are part of the process and we are not just shoving this down their throats. If nobody shows up then I would feel a lot better about voting for it. If they do show up and voice their opinions and I will try to get them to come and do that, then we can see what they are doing and thinking about all of this.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I would just note that first of all the civic center is opening soon and as an example I will use the entertainment of from \$15 to \$100. We collected \$15 for an entertainment license for the concerts at Singer Park. Now the hours that were put in just by the Clerk's Office alone and that is not including anybody else that was involved like the Police Department, Mayor's Office and others, attributed obviously to far greater than even \$100. There are other things that pay. The restaurants in the area get a restaurant license so it does not affect their entertainment. Their entertainment is included as part of their restaurant/dance license. They are under a different category and we are not anticipating changing that. The sidewalk café, you have to have somebody from Building go out and inspect and there are costs to the City. I think that the basis was just to bring that up enough to cover some of the time that the City invests in going out and looking. The fairs again are something that have to be checked. There is a lot of paperwork and time involved with that. I think the civic center, if you don't do something to monitor the peddler activity there, you are definitely going to have some problems. The peddlers are not somebody who is going to pay the business owner. That is not the way it works. They get a peddling license from the City to operate in front of a parking area or whatever.

Alderman Levasseur stated many of the people who own the properties downtown are also paying another fee with the Intown tax. I agree with the Deputy Clerk on the entertainment, especially for the concerts. I don't know if we could separate that out to a separate entertainment fee. Obviously they are pulling in some big money for that and that is a big event. I think the \$10 to \$50 for a sidewalk café...I really want to give incentives for people to put those tables out. I don't want to take away...there are some small places that only put out two tables and as I said to keep hitting them with more and more fees is probably not where I would like to go. To be honest with you, the civic center peddler fee from \$150 to \$400...I don't think that is enough. If you have 40 hockey games then the peddler's outside would only be paying \$10/event. Now that is just for 40 hockey games. You figure you throw another 50 events on top of that and you are bringing the price down to actually \$2/event. I don't mind the entertainment going up. I would like to see the civic center peddler fee going up. I would like to see the sidewalk café kept at a reasonable fee of maybe \$25. I don't know if you guys

are willing to not go to public hearing and make some adjustments here. What do you want to do?

Chairman Hirschmann stated the Committee on Administration has authority over setting these fees. What we have authority over is whether or not it goes to a public hearing. These have already been discussed and networked. These are all legitimate fees. The only political problem you could possibly get into is if you don't let the public have a voice, which the ordinance allows for us to have a public hearing and we post it and if one person or fifty people show up they have their say on these fees. You are right. These fees do look presentable and respectable to do the work we need to do. The only one I question is fairs. We are here to decide whether to have a public hearing or not.

Chairman Hirschmann called for a vote. The motion carried with Aldermen Levasseur and Hirschmann duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Levasseur stated I would like to put in a note that I am not happy with these fees.

Alderman Lopez stated I fully agree with you Alderman Levasseur but for this to get this far has taken months. With the civic center opening I think we are going to open up a can of worms and that is why I say no.

Alderman Thibault stated I also agree with what you are saying, Alderman Levasseur, however being under the gun with the civic center here I think is a problem. These fees can be reviewed next year or the year after. I would think that the Committee on Administration has spent a lot of time on this.

Alderman Levasseur stated I voiced my very strong opinion against the parking fees that were levied against the downtown area way back in June when everyone thought they were under the gun in June and I think that most of you already know what people downtown are feeling about that decision and it was a 13-1 vote. As a person who has been downtown for 15 years, I kind of think I have a bit of an advantage over you guys but I want to let you know that down the road this is going to come back at you and you will have to face that. I will probably be on the other side yelling in next time.

Chairman Hirschmann addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Report from the Committee on Traffic/Public Safety regarding increased fines for parking violations.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated there had been some concern originally because they were going up so high and there was a third column there. They removed that third column and made some adjustments before it came to this Committee. I just thought I would note that. There was originally some objection about it going from \$15 to \$20 and then \$40 after 14 days. They left it at the \$20 and made some adjustments.

Chairman Hirschmann stated I was under the impression that this didn't have to come to the Committee. Didn't we have that discussion before for fines?

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied this is actually one that had been processed and it was determined not to do it because it was fines and not fees. It should be received and file or actually just withdrawn.

Chairman Hirschmann stated I just want to explain to the Committee that the City Solicitor, myself and the Deputy Clerk had a meeting about this issue and it was determined by the Solicitor that it really shouldn't be on our agenda because public hearings are held in regards to fees. This is fines and not fees. The Traffic Committee set a policy on fines and it was mistakenly put on our agenda by the opinion of the Solicitor.

Alderman Levasseur stated I was the one who asked that this come to this Committee because I believe that the Charter calls for any kind of fees or fines... that it had to come before the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment & Revenue Administration. As a matter of fact, I had been told that by somebody in Finance. Is this a semantic decision as to whether it is a fine or a fee?

Chairman Hirschmann replied fees are a charge for service. A fine is a penalty and this Committee doesn't enforce penalties.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated it wasn't in the Charter. It was a policy established by the Board and it was related to fees and if the fees were to go up within a certain percentage it was to come here for a determination as to whether or not a public hearing was to be held. I believe this Ordinance has already passed the full Board.

Alderman Levasseur stated I agree with you. I voted against this at the full Board because it was three days before the budget had to be done and I thought we were skipping a step, which was that it had to go before the Accounts Committee.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied the Solicitor ruled that it didn't have to.

Alderman Levasseur responded not that night he didn't.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied yes he did. It shouldn't have been placed on the agenda. I apologize for that.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to receive and file.

Chairman Hirschmann addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Communication from Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Public Works Director,  
regarding the Johns Manville Settlement Fund.

Alderman Lopez moved the item for discussion. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Hirschmann stated in communication with the Finance Office, our revenue stream is performing poorly and possibly tanking and there is some concern about pulling it off and starting other untouchable funds. We want to possibly keep this in the general fund. Am I stating this correctly?

Mr. Sherman stated this is a general fund revenue. We do have the ability under the Charter to appropriate surplus revenues if the City and the Finance Officer certifies that there are surplus revenues. If obviously after three months we are not aware that this is going to be surplus, we are willing to sort of hold this one and see how we make it through the year. Right now revenues are not coming in at projected levels. We really don't anticipate that we are going to meet our budget which means that by the time we get to the end of the year we won't have surplus revenues and these will just have to go into the general revenue fund. My recommendation at this point would be to refer it to the Mayor and the budget process. If the Highway Department feels that they need to set-up reserves to maintain the schools and deal with those issues that is probably not a bad idea. Unfortunately, the revenue source even though it is not something that we necessarily planned for, we really shouldn't be setting it aside for a specific purpose at this time.

Alderman Lopez asked when you say hold it or refer it to the Mayor and the budget, would it be better just to table it for now.

Mr. Sherman answered yes you could table it for now and that would do two things. Again, we could refer it to get it into the CIP process. Kevin Sheppard is here and I am sure they do all of their CIP forms. Again, we could hold it and see how the revenues go for this year and if we do end up having surplus revenues

then maybe this is something that we do want to do. Certainly at this point I think it is premature.

Alderman Lopez stated either way in January somebody is going to be making the budget so tabling this you still have the money and it is not a problem. It is just tabling the request from the Highway Department.

Mr. Sherman replied correct.

Alderman Thibault stated but you are going to keep it on this agenda constantly. Why not just do what he is saying and keep it aside without spending it and if in fact revenues do come in the way they are supposed to they will put it in CIP or something?

Alderman Lopez stated in tabling this, at least the item from the Highway Department is still there, the money is still there and it is not being used for anything else and Kevin has the money in the surplus and this could resurface during January or February and if there is a surplus we would only have to act on the request because the request is here. If we do anything else, they are going to have to resubmit everything all over again.

Mr. Sherman replied that is correct and then it tends to get lost sometimes.

Alderman Lopez moved to table this item. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Hirschmann called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

### **TABLED ITEMS**

#### **10. Revenue Policy & Collections Ordinance.**

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Alderman Lopez stated I noticed in one of the audits that it was mentioned that the City didn't have a policy on revenues. Are we holding anything up for the departments? I understand from your audit the way I read it is wait for the City to come up with something and then we will do something.

Mr. Sherman replied we are actually in the process of putting together a number of policies and procedures of which the revenue policy is one. One of the things that is a key that Ms. Shaffer brought up earlier is that by adopting this policy it would give us the ability to charge interest and penalties on the accounts receivables. However, that being said, my recommendation on this at this point would be to forward this back to the Finance Department. We got some very good comments from Mr. Dillon at the Airport. I think what we would like to do is take the policy back. Our thought is to strip out all of the Enterprise funds so that we can deal with those separately because they are unique and have their own quirks and procedures that they need to follow. Again, my recommendation would be to take this off the table and send it back to Finance. We will rework it dealing with just the general fund departments and maybe we will come in with just the interest and penalty part so that we can get that one done. I think that is a little bit of leverage that we are leaving on the table at this point and it would help us on the receivable side.

Alderman Lopez stated you may not know, but that has already been done by this Committee and given to Kevin. When Mr. Dillon was here a few months ago, there was a dispute or disagreement and we gave it back to Kevin to go back and work on it and come back to this Committee. That is already done. You do have the authority to go and do that and bring a recommendation back. This would help the department heads if the auditors and what I am referring to is they are waiting for a City revenue policy.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to refer this item to Finance to work on and resubmit.

11. Discussion regarding policy on collection of open invoices over ninety days.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to receive and file this item.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee